OLIVER WELCH.

[To accompany bill H. R. No. 90.]

MARCH 5, 1840.

Mr. Dellet, from the Committee on Private Land Claims, made the following

REPORT:

The Committee on Private Land Claims, to whom was referred the petition of Oliver Welch, report:

It appears, by the evidence in this case, that the petitioner had, but a short time prior to making the entry of the tract of public land referred to, settled in that part of the country; and that he had not made himself acquainted with the marks on the corner-stakes, so as to enable him, in that way, to ascertain the numbers of such tracts of land as he wished to enter; but that he usually designated such tracts by pointing out their connexion with other lands which he had previously purchased. In this case, the petitioner seems confident that he did correctly point out to the register of the land office the tract of land which he wished to enter; but it seems more probable that the petitioner was himself mistaken; but it is not believed he is guilty of negligence. It cannot be the true policy of the General Government so to take advantage of the mistakes of its citizens as to withhold from them moneys received for lands which are entirely worthless. The committee have, therefore, reported a bill.

Blair & Rives, printers.

spot where they fell; and, also, for the surpose of specting the institution to

To accompany but I to See a grant of the Dade Dade Dade Institute of Flarida, be all R. No. 30] in ed. all results of the Dade Institute of Flarida, be all R. No. 30]

Макси 5, 1840.

Mr. Derter, from the Committee on Private Land Claims, made the fol-

REPORT:

The Committee on Private Land Chims, to whom was referred the petition of Oliver Welch, report:

It appears, by the evidence, in this case, that the petitioner had, but a short time prior to making the entry of the tract of public land referred to, settled in that part of the country; and that he had not made himself acquainted with the marks on the corner-stakes, so as to enable him, in that way, to ascertain the numbers of such tracts of land as he wished to enter; but that he usually designated such tracts by pointing out their connexion with other lands which he had previously purchased. In this case, the petitioner seems confident that he did correctly point out to the register of the land office the tract of land which he wished to enter; but it seems more probable that the petitioner was himself mistaken; but it is not bedieved he is guilty of negligence. It cannot be the true policy of the General Government so to take advantage of the mistakes of its citizens as to withheld from them moneys received for lands which are entirely worthless. The committee have, therefore, reported a bill.

Blair & Rives, printers.